arXiv:1610.03161v1 [cond-mat.stat-mech] 11 Oct 2016

Quantum Violation of Fluctuation-Dissipation Theorem

Akira Shimizu and Kyota Fujikura

Department of Basic Science, The University of Tokyo
3-8-1 Komaba, Meguro-City, Tokyo 153-8902, Japan

E-mail: shmz@asone.c.u-tokyo.ac.jp

12 October 2016

Abstract. We study quantum measurements of temporal equilibrium fluctuations in macroscopic quantum systems. It is shown that the fluctuation-dissipation theorem is partially violated in quantum systems, as a relation between observed quantities, even if measurements are made in an ideal way that mimics classical ideal measurements as closely as possible. This is a genuine quantum effect, which survives on a macroscopic scale. We also show that the state realized during measurements of temporal equilibrium fluctuations is a 'squeezed equilibrium state,' which is macroscopically identical to the pre-measurement equilibrium state but is squeezed by the measurement. It is a time-evolving state, in which macrovariables fluctuate and relax. We also explain some of subtle but important points, careless treatments of which often lead to unphysical results, of the linear response theory.

1. Introduction

The fluctuation-dissipation theorem (FDT) is widely regarded as a universal relation between linear response functions and temporal equilibrium fluctuations which are expressed by time correlations [1, 2, 3, 5, 4, 6, 7, 8, 9]. It states

$$\text{linear response function} = \beta \times \text{temporal equilibrium fluctuation}, \quad (1)$$

$$= \beta \times \text{time correlation in equilibrium}, \quad (2)$$

where β denotes the inverse temperature, $1/T$. There is another FDT, sometimes called the FDT of the second kind [10], which states that for the Langevin equation the noise correlation is related to the linear response function. We here consider the above FDT, sometimes called the FDT of the first kind [10], which can be tested directly by experiments.

The FDT resembles the 'fluctuation-response relation' in equilibrium statistical mechanics, which relates thermodynamic responses (such as the specific heat and static magnetic susceptibility) to ensemble fluctuations (such as the variance of the energy in the Gibbs ensemble). However, the response functions in the FDT are nonequilibrium (dissipative) properties, whereas the thermodynamic responses in the

fluctuation-response relation are equilibrium properties. Because of this basic difference, the former is related to the temporal fluctuations, whereas the latter is related to the ensemble fluctuation which are essentially spatial correlations in the Gibbs ensemble.‡ Hence, the FDT is considered as a fundamental relation in nonequilibrium statistical mechanics [10]. Actually, all elements of response functions are not necessarily related to dissipation directly, but the term FDT is used generally for relations (1) and (2) [9].

Experimentally, many evidences have been reported that support the FDT. However, most of them, including the pioneering work by Johnson [2], are limited to the real part of the *symmetric part* (as defined in section 5.3.2) of the response function, such as the real part of the diagonal conductivity $\mathrm{Re}\sigma_{xx}$, in the so-called *classical regime* $\hbar\omega \ll k_B T$. Thus a question arises: Does the FDT really hold in other cases? That is, is the FDT really a universal relation?

We here show that the answer is no. As a relation between observed quantities, the FDT holds *only* in the above limited case. For example, it is violated for the real antisymmetric part of the admittance (which is the Fourier transform of response function) even in the classical regime. A typical example is the Hall conductivity σ_{xy} at $\omega = 0$. Even for the real symmetric part, for which the FDT holds in the classical regime, the FDT is violated in the non-classical regime $\hbar\omega \gtrsim k_B T$. The violation is a genuine quantum effect, which appears on the macroscopic scale.

We also obtain explicitly the state that is realized during measurements of temporal equilibrium fluctuations. It is a 'squeezed equilibrium state,' which is macroscopically identical to the pre-measurement equilibrium state but is squeezed by the measurement. It is a time-evolving state, in which macrovariables fluctuate and relax. Such an interesting state should be realized during quasiclassical measurements of temporal equilibrium fluctuations.

Since the main points of the theory were already described in [11], we emphasize physical aspects in this paper. For clarity, we also explain some of subtle but important points of the linear response theory, careless treatments of which often lead to unphysical results that are found in the literature.

The paper is organized as follows. In section 2, we explain the problems in the previous derivations of the FDT for quantum systems. We then describe the assumptions of the present analysis in section 3. In section 4, using modern theory of quantum measurements, we analyze the process of measuring the time correlation. We then show the violation of the FDT in section 5. These results are discussed in section 6 and summarized in section 7.

‡ The term 'equilibrium fluctuation' is often used both for the temporal fluctuations and for the ensemble fluctuation. We avoid such a confusing terminology, except when confusion is unlikely.



Figure 1. An external field $F(t)$ and the time evolution of an additive observable B when (a) the response function is measured, and (b) the temporal equilibrium fluctuation is measured.

2. What's wrong with derivations of FDT for quantum systems

2.1. Classical systems

For a classical system, Einstein discovered theoretically the first example of the FDT [1], by assuming a stochastic model. Another important example was discovered experimentally by Johnson [2]. Nyquist presented an elegant theory that derived Johnson's results [3]. He first established the universality of the FDT from the second law of thermodynamics, and then derived the FDT for classical electric circuits. Furthermore, he introduced a quantum effect intuitively into his result.

In these works, Nyquist utilized a macroscopic theory (thermodynamics and circuit theory) and Einstein utilized a mesoscopic theory (stochastic model). Green also developed a mesoscopic theory [4]. Microscopic derivations, i.e., derivations from Newtonian mechanics of point particles, of the FDT were given by Takahashi for general classical systems [5].

2.2. Quantum systems

The microscopic derivation by Takahshi [5] of the FDT for classical systems appeared generalizable to quantum systems because of the similarity between classical and quantum mechanics. However, he hesitated such generalization because disturbances (backactions) caused by quantum measurements should be considered seriously. He stated "This, however, introduces a rather profound difficulty, which originates in the very nature of quantum mechanical observation, that every observation disturbs the system" [5].

His concern may be understood by considering how the response functions and fluctuations are measured. When measuring a response function, one applies an external field $F(t)$ to the system and measure the time variation of a macrovariable, say B, as shown in Figure 1(a). When measuring the temporal equilibrium fluctuation of B, one takes $F(t) = 0$ and measures the variation of B, as shown in Figure 1(b). In both cases,

one usually performs multi-time (or continuous) measurements to obtain values of B at various times. In the case of two-time measurements, for example, one measures B at $t = t_0$ and *subsequently* at $t = t_1$. Consequently, disturbance by the first measurement at $t = t_0$ affects the result of the second measurement at $t = t_1$. Such a process is described not by the unitary time evolution (i.e., the Schrödinger or von Neumann equation) but by a non-unitary evolution [12, 13, 14, 15].

However, Callen and Welton [6], Nakano [7], and Kubo [8] studied the FDT for quantum systems assuming the unitary evolution, completely neglecting the disturbances by measurements. Actually, for the temporal equilibrium fluctuation Callen and Welton, Nakano and Kubo, and Nyquist (who introduced a quantum effect intuitively) [3] claimed different time correlations, which agree with each other only for classical systems. (See, e.g., section 5.4 and footnote 8 in section 5.5.2.) Among them, the most widely used for quantum systems seems Kubo's result, which for the transverse electrical conductivity agrees with Nakano's [7]. We therefore consider the 'Kubo formula.' It states (see section 5.1 for details)

$$\text{linear response function } = \beta \times \text{canonical time correlation}, \tag{3}$$

where the *canonical time correlation* is defined by

$$\langle \hat{X}; \hat{Y}(t) \rangle_{\text{eq}} \equiv \frac{1}{\beta} \int_0^\beta \langle e^{\lambda \hat{H}} \hat{X} e^{-\lambda \hat{H}} \hat{Y}(t) \rangle_{\text{eq}} d\lambda \tag{4}$$

for two Heisenberg operators $\hat{X} = \hat{X}(0)$ and $\hat{Y}(t) = e^{i\hat{H}t/\hbar} \hat{Y} e^{-i\hat{H}t/\hbar}$. Here, $\langle \cdot \rangle_{\text{eq}}$ denotes the equilibrium expectation value.

2.3. What are the problems

For classical systems, the FDT is considered to be hold not just as a formal relation but as a relation between observed quantities. This point is very important because the left- and right-hand sides of the FDT correspond to quite different experiments, as shown in Figure 1. This means, e.g., that by measuring the response function one can deduce what will be observed when fluctuation is measured, and vice versa.

For quantum systems, however, this point has been unclear because, as mentioned above, the previous derivations [6, 7, 8] neglected disturbances by measurements which are inevitable in quantum systems. Thus, the question is: Does the FDT holds in quantum systems as relations between observed quantities?

By comparing (2) with (3), we can see what are the problems, as shown in Figure 2. One is whether the linear response function by the Kubo formula agrees with the observed one. The other is whether the canonical time correlation agrees with the observed time correlation. These problems have been left unsolved because at the time of the above pioneering works neither quantum measurement theory [12, 13, 14, 15] nor theory of macroscopic quantum systems [16, 17, 18, 19, 20] was developed enough. Fortunately, both these theories have been developed greatly in last few decades. This enabled us to solve the problem.


Kubo: linear response function = β × canonical time correlation
disturbance → ||?
disturbance → ||?
FDT: linear response function = β × time correlation in equilibrium
observed one
observed one

Figure 2. Comparison of the Kubo formula and the FDT as a relation between observed quantities. The question is whether each hand side of the two relations agrees with each other in the presence of disturbances by quantum measurements.


Kubo: linear response function = β × canonical time correlation
disturbance ↛ ||
disturbance → ⫴
FDT: linear response function ≠ β × time correlation in equilibrium
observed one
observed one

Figure 3. Our result for the question raised in Figure 2, and its consequence that the FDT is violated as a relation between observed quantities.

One might wonder if macrovariables are so affected by quantum disturbances. Our answer is no, when response is measured. Hence, the Kubo formula might be correct *as a recipe* to calculate response functions. However, the answer is yes, when fluctuation is measured. That is, canonical time correlation does not agree with the observed time correlation. Therefore, Figure 2 is updated as Figure 3. Since the canonical time correlation does not agree with the observed time correlation, the FDT is violated as a relation between observed quantities. We shall present how we have derived these results.

3. Assumptions

3.1. Assumptions on equilibrium states

We consider d-dimensional macroscopic systems ($d = 1, 2, 3, \cdots$), of size N (which is, e.g., the number of spins). The pre-measurement state is an equilibrium state of temperature T ($= 1/\beta$). As its microscopic representation, we employ the 'canonical thermal pure quantum state' $|\beta\rangle$ [21], which is a pure quantum state that gives the same results as the canonical Gibbs state. Unlike an energy eigenstate, a thermal pure quantum state always gives accurate results [21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30]. Hence, the equilibrium expectation value is obtained simply as the quantum-mechanical expectation value, $\langle \cdot \rangle_{\rm eq} = \langle\beta| \cdot |\beta\rangle$. Although the use of $|\beta\rangle$ simplifies equations, the

unpleasant user can replace it with the canonical Gibbs state $\hat{\rho}_{\rm eq}$ appropriately in the following results. [For example, formula (10) for the post-measurement state should be replaced with that for a mixed state.]

We assume that the correlation between any local observables at two points $\boldsymbol{r}$ and $\boldsymbol{r}'$ decays faster than $1/|\boldsymbol{r}-\boldsymbol{r}'|^{d+\epsilon}$, where ϵ is a positive constant independent. This assumption is believed to hold generally, except at critical points. Consequently, for all additive observable $\hat{A}$, its ensemble fluctuation [31, 32, 33]

$$\delta A_{\rm eq} \equiv \sqrt{\langle (\Delta \hat{A})^2 \rangle_{\rm eq}} = O(\sqrt{N}). \tag{5}$$

Here, $\Delta \hat{A} \equiv \hat{A} - \langle \hat{A} \rangle_{\rm eq}$. [Throughout this paper, Δ denotes deviation from the equilibrium value.] We also make additional reasonable assumptions (see Supplemental Material of [11] for details). Then, the quantum central limit theorem holds [16, 17, 11, 34], from which we can draw the following universal results.

3.2. Assumptions on measurements

Consider measurements of temporal equilibrium fluctuations by measuring time correlations. If a violent detector were used, it would destroy completely the state by the first measurement, and consequently a foolish result would be obtained for the 2nd measurement. As a result, a wrong result would be obtained for the correlation, and obviously the FDT would look violated. Therefore, certain "ideal" detectors should be used to measure the time correlation correctly.

In classical systems, an ideal detector is trivially defined as a detector that does not disturb the state at all. In quantum systems, however, such a detector is impossible because of the uncertainty relation. Hence, to inspect the validity of the FDT in quantum systems, the best possible way is to use a detector that mimics the classical ideal one as closely as possible. We call such a detector *quasiclassical*.

We note that a quasiclassical measurement should have a moderate magnitude of error. For measuring the temporal equilibrium fluctuation, which is of the same order as the ensemble fluctuation $\delta A_{\rm eq}$, the measurement error $\delta A_{\rm err}$ should be smaller, $\delta A_{\rm err} < \delta A_{\rm eq}$. On the other hand, $\delta A_{\rm err}$ should not be too small because the disturbance increases with decreasing $\delta A_{\rm err}$, according to the uncertainty relation between error and disturbance [35]. We therefore require

$$\delta A_{\rm err} = \varepsilon \delta A_{\rm eq}, \tag{6}$$

where ε is a small positive number independent of N. [Actually, the following results hold also for larger ε if it is independent of N.] Since $\delta A_{\rm eq} = O(\sqrt{N})$ as mentioned above, this means $\delta A_{\rm err} = O(\sqrt{N})$. Therefore, to formulate measurements of temporal equilibrium fluctuations, we should scale additive operators as

$$\hat{a} = \hat{A}/\sqrt{N}. \tag{7}$$

We shall use such scaled operators.

Generally, quantum measurement is described as follows [15, 36, 37]. Let $|\psi\rangle$ be the pre-measurement state. Suppose that $\hat{a}$ is measured, and the outcome $a_\bullet$ is obtained. Then, the probability of getting $a_\bullet$ is given by the *probability operator* $\hat{E}_{a_\bullet}$ as

$$p(a_\bullet) = \langle\psi|\hat{E}_{a_\bullet}|\psi\rangle. \tag{8}$$

The probability operator can be represented as the product of *measurement operator* $\hat{M}_{a_\bullet}$ as

$$\hat{E}_{a_\bullet} = \hat{M}^\dagger_{a_\bullet}\hat{M}_{a_\bullet}. \tag{9}$$

The post-measurement state is given by the measurement operator as

$$\text{post-measurement state} = \sqrt{1/p(a_\bullet)}\ \hat{M}_{a_\bullet}|\psi\rangle, \tag{10}$$

where the prefactor $\sqrt{1/p(a_\bullet)}$ is just a normalization constant.

Using this general framework, we precisely define *quasiclassical measurement* of additive observables as follows.

(i) $\hat{E}_{a_\bullet}$ scales as $\sqrt{N}$ with increasing N. This yields, e.g., $\delta a_{\rm err} = O(1)$, i.e., $\delta A_{\rm err} = O(\sqrt{N})$ as required.

(ii) $\hat{M}_{a_\bullet}$ is minimally disturbing [37] among many possible measurement operators that give the same $\hat{E}_{a_\bullet}$. That is [37],

$$\hat{M}_{a_\bullet} = \sqrt{\hat{E}_{a_\bullet}}. \tag{11}$$

(iii) homogeneous. This yields, e.g., a reasonable property that $\delta a_{\rm err}$ = independent of $a_\bullet$. (Otherwise, analysis of experimental results would be complicated.)
From (i)-(iii), we find $\hat{M}_{a_\bullet} = f(\hat{a} - a_\bullet)$, where $f(x) \geq 0$.

(iv) unbiased, i.e., $\overline{a_\bullet} = \langle\hat{a}\rangle_{\rm eq}$, where $\overline{\cdots}$ denotes the average over many runs of experiments. That is, by averaging the outcomes over many runs of experiments, one obtains the correct expectation value.

(v) $f(x)$ behaves well enough, e.g., it vanishes quickly as $|x| \to \infty$. [Detailed conditions are described in Supplemental Material of [11].]

Roughly speaking, we say measurement is quasiclassical if it is minimally-disturbing, homogeneous, and unbiased, with a moderate magnitudes of error (which is small enough to measure fluctuations but not too small in order to avoid strong disturbances). Concretely, the measurement error $\delta A_{\rm err} = \sqrt{N}\delta a_{\rm err}$ is determined by $f(x)$ as

$$\delta a^2_{\rm err} = \int x^2 |f(x)|^2 dx = O(1), \tag{12}$$

in consistency with (6).

A typical example is the case of the *Gaussian measurement operator*, for which

$$f(x) = \frac{1}{(2\pi w^2)^{1/4}} \exp\left(-\frac{x^2}{4w^2}\right), \quad w = O(1) > 0, \tag{13}$$

$$\hat{M}_{a_\bullet} = f(\hat{a} - a_\bullet) = \frac{1}{(2\pi w^2)^{1/4}} \exp\left[-\frac{(\hat{a} - a_\bullet)^2}{4w^2}\right], \tag{14}$$

$$\delta a^2_{\rm err} = w^2 = O(1) \qquad (\text{i.e., } \delta A_{\rm err} = w\sqrt{N} = O(\sqrt{N})). \tag{15}$$


$t = 0^-$: equilibrium state = $|\beta\rangle$ (thermal pure quantum state)
$\downarrow$
$t = 0$: measurement of $\hat{A} = \hat{a}\sqrt{N}$ $\Rightarrow$ outcome $A_\bullet = a_\bullet\sqrt{N}$
post-measurement state = $|\beta; a_\bullet\rangle$
$\downarrow$ free evolution
$t > 0$: $e^{-i\hat{H}t/\hbar}|\beta; a_\bullet\rangle$
measurement of $\hat{A}$ (or another additive operator $\hat{B}$) $\Rightarrow$ outcome
$\Downarrow$ From the two outcomes ....
Obtain : correlation of $\hat{A}(0)$ and $\hat{A}(t)$ (or $\hat{B}(t)$)

Figure 4. A process of measurement of the time correlation of an additive observable at $t = 0$, $\hat{A}(0)$, and that (or another additive operator $\hat{B}$) at $t > 0$, $\hat{A}(t)$.

4. Measurement of time correlation

In this section, we study what is obtained when temporal equilibrium fluctuation is measured. The hurried reader, who is not interested in the measurement process, can jump to the last paragraphs of section 4.1 and section 4.2, where the main results of section 4 are summarized.

In Figure 4 we show a process of measurement of the time correlation of an additive observable at $t = 0$, $\hat{A}(0)$, and that (or another additive operator $\hat{B}$) at $t > 0$, $\hat{A}(t)$. The state just before the first measurement is an equilibrium state, which is represented by the canonical thermal pure quantum state $|\beta\rangle$ [21]. At $t = 0$, the first measurement of $\hat{A} = \hat{a}\sqrt{N}$ is made, and the outcome $A_\bullet = a_\bullet\sqrt{N}$ is obtained. The post-measurement state is denoted by $|\beta; a_\bullet\rangle$. It evolves freely as $^{-i\hat{H}t/\hbar}|\beta; a_\bullet\rangle$, until the second measurement of $\hat{A}$ (or another additive operator $\hat{B}$) is made at $t > 0$, and the outcome of this measurement is obtained. From the outcomes of the first and second measurements, one obtains the correlation of $\hat{A}(0)$ and $\hat{A}(t)$ (or $\hat{B}(t)$).

In this process, the first measurement should be quasiclassical in order to minimize the disturbance, which affects the result of the second measurement. On the other hand, the second measurement can be either quasiclassical or error-less, because its post-measurement state will not be measured and hence the disturbance is irrelevant.

We shall analyze this process step by step. Although this process assumes that measurements are performed twice in each run of experiments, more general processes, in which measurement is performed three or more times in each run, are also analyzed in [11].

Since our results are derived using the quantum central limit theorem [16, 17, 11, 34], they hold universally, irrespective of details of the system, provided that the system satisfies the assumptions in section 3.1. Although the main results hold in the

thermodynamics limit, we do not write the limit symbol explicitly except when we want to stress it.

4.1. First measurement and its disturbances

For the first measurement at $t = 0$, the probability density of getting a particular value of the outcome $a_\bullet$ is calculated, for the Gaussian f of (13), as

$$p(a_\bullet) = \frac{1}{[2\pi(\delta a_{\rm eq}^2 + \delta a_{\rm err}^2)]^{1/2}} \exp\left[-\frac{1}{2(\delta a_{\rm eq}^2 + \delta a_{\rm err}^2)}(\Delta a_\bullet)^2\right], \tag{16}$$

where $\delta a_{\rm eq}^2 \equiv \delta A_{\rm eq}/\sqrt{N}$ and

$$\Delta a_\bullet \equiv a_\bullet - \langle \hat{a} \rangle_{\rm eq}. \tag{17}$$

It is seen that the width of the distribution of $a_\bullet$ is larger than the actual width $\delta a_{\rm eq}$ of $\hat{a}$, because of the measurement error $\delta a_{\rm err}$. For general f, we obtain a similar result:

$$p(a_\bullet) = \int \frac{|f(x)|^2}{(2\pi\delta a_{\rm eq}^2)^{1/2}} \exp\left[-\frac{(x + \Delta a_\bullet)^2}{2\delta a_{\rm eq}^2}\right] dx, \tag{18}$$

which is a convolution of the distribution of $\hat{a}$ in $\hat{\rho}_{\rm eq}$ and the shape $|f(x)|^2$ of the measurement operator.

The post-measurement state $|\beta; a_\bullet\rangle$ is given, according to (10), by

$$|\beta; a_\bullet\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{p(a_\bullet)}} f(\hat{a} - a_\bullet)|\beta\rangle. \tag{19}$$

To investigate its properties, we calculate the expectation value and variance of $\hat{a}$ in this state. We denote $\langle\ \cdot\ \rangle_{a_\bullet} \equiv \langle\beta; a_\bullet| \cdot |\beta; a_\bullet\rangle$. For the Gaussian f, we find

$$\langle \Delta\hat{a} \rangle_{a_\bullet} \equiv \langle \hat{a} \rangle_{a_\bullet} - \langle \hat{a} \rangle_{\rm eq} = \frac{\delta a_{\rm eq}^2}{\delta a_{\rm eq}^2 + \delta a_{\rm err}^2} \Delta a_\bullet, \tag{20}$$

which shows that $\hat{a}$ is shifted toward the outcome as a result of the "collapse of the wavefunction." For the variance, we find

$$\langle (\hat{a} - \langle \hat{a} \rangle_{a_\bullet})^2 \rangle_{a_\bullet} = \left[1 \ - \ \frac{\delta a_{\rm eq}^2}{\delta a_{\rm eq}^2 + \delta a_{\rm err}^2}\right] \delta a_{\rm eq}^2, \tag{21}$$

which shows that the state is 'squeezed' (i.e., the variance is reduced) along $\hat{a}$. These results are summarized schematically in Figure 5.

For another additive operator $\hat{B} = \hat{b}\sqrt{N}$, we have

$$\langle \Delta\hat{b} \rangle_{a_\bullet} \equiv \langle \hat{b} \rangle_{a_\bullet} - \langle \hat{b} \rangle_{\rm eq} = \frac{\langle \frac{1}{2}\{\Delta\hat{a}, \Delta\hat{b}\} \rangle_{\rm eq}}{\delta a_{\rm eq}^2 + \delta a_{\rm err}^2} \Delta a_\bullet, \tag{22}$$

where $\frac{1}{2}\{\hat{X}, \hat{Y}\} \equiv \frac{1}{2}\left(\hat{X}\hat{Y} + \hat{Y}\hat{X}\right)$ is the anticommutator. It shows that $\hat{b}$ is also shifted as a result of the measurement, and the sign and magnitude of the shift depend on those of $\langle \frac{1}{2}\{\Delta\hat{a}, \Delta\hat{b}\} \rangle_{\rm eq}$. We also have

$$\langle (\hat{b} - \langle \hat{b} \rangle_{a_\bullet})^2 \rangle_{a_\bullet} = \delta b_{\rm eq}^2 - \frac{\langle \frac{1}{2}\{\Delta\hat{a}, \Delta\hat{b}\} \rangle_{\rm eq}^2}{\delta a_{\rm eq}^2 + \delta a_{\rm err}^2} + \frac{\langle \frac{1}{2i}[\hat{a}, \hat{b}] \rangle_{\rm eq}^2}{\delta a_{\rm err}^2}. \tag{23}$$



Figure 5. Schematic plots of the distribution of an additive observable A in the pre-measurement state $|\beta\rangle$ (left) and in the post-measurement state $|\beta; a_\bullet\rangle$ (right).

The second last term represents the reduction of the variance by the measurement, while the last term shows that the variance increases by the measurement if $[\hat{a}, \hat{b}]$ is non-negligible in $|\beta\rangle$. Since the magnitude of the variance is determined by these competing terms, the variance of $\hat{b}$ is not necessarily reduced by the measurement of $\hat{a}$ when $[\hat{a}, \hat{b}] \neq 0$. For general f, we obtain similar results, which depend on f [the cases of $t = 0$ in (25) and in Eq. (13) of [11]].

Since the right-hand sides of (20)-(23) are $O(1)$, we find that *disturbances on additive operators* $\hat{A}, \hat{B}, ...$ *by quasiclassical measurements are* $O(\sqrt{N})$, which is of the same order as the equilibrium fluctuations. This means that the post-measurement state $|\beta; a_\bullet\rangle$ is *macroscopically identical* to the pre-measurement equilibrium state $|\beta\rangle$, although $|\beta; a_\bullet\rangle$ is squeezed along $\hat{a}$. Hence, $|\beta; a_\bullet\rangle$ may be called a 'squeezed equilibrium state.' Such a state should be realized in fluctuation experiments.

4.2. Second measurement and obtained time correlation

The post-measurement state evolves freely as $^{-i\hat{H}t/\hbar}|\beta; a_\bullet\rangle$, until the second measurement is made at $t > 0$. When an additive observable $\hat{B} = \hat{b}\sqrt{N}$ is measured in this 2nd measurement, its expectation value is calculated as

$$\begin{aligned}\langle \Delta\hat{b}(t)\rangle_{a_\bullet} &\equiv \langle \hat{b}(t)\rangle_{a_\bullet} - \langle \hat{b}\rangle_{\rm eq} \\ &= \Theta(t)\langle \tfrac{1}{2}\{\Delta\hat{a}, \Delta\hat{b}(t)\}\rangle_{\rm eq} \frac{\Delta a_\bullet}{\delta a_{\rm eq}^2 + \delta a_{\rm err}^2}. \end{aligned} \tag{24}$$

Here, $\Theta(t)$ is the step function, which says simply that if this measurement were made before the first one then the equilibrium value would be obtained (i.e., $\langle \hat{b}(t)\rangle_{a_\bullet} = \langle \hat{b}\rangle_{\rm eq}$). For general f, we obtain a similar result:

$$\langle \Delta\hat{b}(t)\rangle_{a_\bullet} = -\Theta(t)\langle \tfrac{1}{2}\{\Delta\hat{a}, \Delta\hat{b}(t)\}\rangle_{\rm eq} \frac{d\ln p}{da_\bullet}, \tag{25}$$

where p is given by (16). It is seen that the t dependence of $\langle\Delta\hat{b}(t)\rangle_{a_\bullet}$ is governed by $\langle\frac{1}{2}\{\Delta\hat{a},\Delta\hat{b}(t)\}\rangle_{\rm eq}$, i.e., by the *symmetrized time correlation*, which is defined (for general $\hat{X}$ and $\hat{Y}(t)=e^{i\hat{H}t/\hbar}\hat{Y}e^{-i\hat{H}t/\hbar}$) by

$$\langle\tfrac{1}{2}\{\hat{X},\hat{Y}(t)\}\rangle_{\rm eq}\equiv\langle\tfrac{1}{2}(\hat{X}\hat{Y}(t)+\hat{Y}(t)\hat{X})\rangle_{\rm eq}. \tag{26}$$

The correlation of $\hat{a}(0)$ and $\hat{b}(t)$ is obtained from the results of the two subsequent measurements as $\Delta a_\bullet\langle\Delta\hat{b}(t)\rangle_{a_\bullet}$. One is interested in its average over many runs of experiments (such average is denoted by the overline),

$$\Xi_{ba}(t)\equiv\overline{\Delta a_\bullet\langle\Delta\hat{b}(t)\rangle_{a_\bullet}}\qquad(t>0). \tag{27}$$

It is calculated from (25) as§

$$\begin{aligned}\Xi_{ba}(t)&=\int\Delta a_\bullet\langle\Delta\hat{b}(t)\rangle_{a_\bullet}\,p(a_\bullet)da_\bullet\\&=-\langle\tfrac{1}{2}\{\Delta\hat{a},\Delta\hat{b}(t)\}\rangle_{\rm eq}\int\Delta a_\bullet p'(a_\bullet)da_\bullet\\&=\langle\tfrac{1}{2}\{\Delta\hat{a},\Delta\hat{b}(t)\}\rangle_{\rm eq}\int p(a_\bullet)da_\bullet\\&=\langle\tfrac{1}{2}\{\Delta\hat{a},\Delta\hat{b}(t)\}\rangle_{\rm eq}\qquad(t>0).\end{aligned} \tag{28}$$

for all f. Note that the last line does not depend on f at all, although both $\langle\Delta\hat{b}(t)\rangle_{a_\bullet}$ and $p(a_\bullet)$ in the first line depend on the form of f. That is, (28) is a universal result, which holds for all quasiclassical measurements.

When $\hat{B}$ is measured at $t<0$ before $\hat{A}$ is measured at $t=0$, their correlation is given by $\langle\frac{1}{2}\{\Delta\hat{b}(t),\Delta\hat{a}\}\rangle_{\rm eq}$. Since this is identical to (28) except that $t<0$ here, we can summarize these results as

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{\Xi}_{ba}(t)&\equiv\text{correlation of }\hat{a}\text{ and }\hat{b}(t)\\&=\langle\tfrac{1}{2}\{\Delta\hat{a},\Delta\hat{b}(t)\}\rangle_{\rm eq}\end{aligned} \tag{29}$$

for all t and f.

We have thus obtained the following universal conclusion: *When temporal equilibrium fluctuations of macrovariables are measured in an ideal way that mimics classical ideal measurements as closely as possible, the symmetrized time correlation is always obtained*, among many quantum correlations that reduce to the same classical correlation as $\hbar\to0$. In other words, if one employs the symmetrized time correlation when quantizing a classical model, the results for the time correlation will be free from disturbances provided that the measurements are quasiclassical.

5. Violation of FDT

5.1. Kubo formula

Suppose that an external field $F(t)$ is applied to an equilibrium state. The system is driven to a non-equilibrium state. We are interested in the change of an additive

§ Actually, this derivation is rather naive. A rigorous derivation is given in Supplemental Material of [11].

observable $\hat{B}$ from its equilibrium value $\langle\hat{B}\rangle_{\rm eq}$ to the non-equilibrium value $\langle\hat{B}\rangle_t$, where $\langle\,\cdot\,\rangle_t$ denotes the expectation value in the presence of $F(t)$. When $F(t)$ is small enough, this change is related linearly to $F(t)$ as

$$\frac{\langle\hat{B}\rangle_t}{N} - \frac{\langle\hat{B}\rangle_{\rm eq}}{N} = \int_{-\infty}^{t} \Phi_{ba}(t-t')F(t')dt'. \tag{30}$$

This relation is called the linear-response relation, and the function $\Phi_{ba}(t)$ is called the (linear) response function. Although this relation is sometimes written in terms of $\langle\hat{B}\rangle_t - \langle\hat{B}\rangle_{\rm eq}$, one should consider $\langle\hat{B}\rangle_t/N - \langle\hat{B}\rangle_{\rm eq}/N$ to take the thermodynamic limit, which is necessary for the Kubo formula (33). As in the case of a symmetry-breaking field in equilibrium statistical mechanics, we take $F(t) = O(1)$. Hence, $\Phi_{ba} = O(1)$.

Assume that the interaction Hamiltonian of $F(t)$ and the system takes the following form,

$$\hat{H}_{\rm ext}(t) = -F(t)\hat{C}, \tag{31}$$

where $\hat{C}$ is an additive observable of the system. Kubo [8] showed, using the first-order perturbation theory, that

$$\Phi_{ba}(t) = \Theta(t) \lim_{N\propto V\to\infty} \frac{1}{i\hbar}\langle[\hat{c}, \hat{b}(t)]\rangle_{\rm eq}, \tag{32}$$

$$= \Theta(t) \lim_{N\propto V\to\infty} \beta\langle\Delta\hat{a}; \Delta\hat{b}(t)\rangle_{\rm eq}, \tag{33}$$

which is called the Kubo formula.‖ Here, the step function $\Theta(t)$ represents the causality, and $\lim_{N\propto V\to\infty}$ denotes the thermodynamic limit where N and V (and other extensive variables) go simultaneously to infinity while keeping their ratio(s) constant. Although not taken in Kubo's paper [8], this limit is necessary for avoiding the quantum recurrence [38]. [As noted in Appendix A, a special care is necessary when this limit and other limits are taken.] Furthermore,

$$\hat{a} \equiv \hat{A}/\sqrt{N},\ \hat{b} \equiv \hat{B}/\sqrt{N},\ \hat{c} \equiv \hat{C}/\sqrt{N} \tag{34}$$

are scaled additive observables,

$$\hat{A} \equiv \frac{d}{dt}\hat{C}(t)\bigg|_{t=0} = \frac{1}{i\hbar}[\hat{C}, \hat{H}] \tag{35}$$

is the velocity of $\hat{C}$, and $\langle\Delta\hat{a}; \Delta\hat{b}(t)\rangle_{\rm eq}$ is the *canonical time correlation*, which is defined (for general $\hat{X}$ and $\hat{Y}(t) = e^{i\hat{H}t/\hbar}\hat{Y}e^{-i\hat{H}t/\hbar}$) by

$$\langle\hat{X}; \hat{Y}(t)\rangle_{\rm eq} \equiv \frac{1}{\beta}\int_0^\beta \langle e^{\lambda\hat{H}}\hat{X}^\dagger e^{-\lambda\hat{H}}\hat{Y}(t)\rangle_{\rm eq} d\lambda. \tag{36}$$

Although (32) is convenient for practical calculations, (33) is often more appropriate for studying fundamental problems.

Note that the condition

$$[\hat{A}, \hat{H}] \neq 0 \text{ and } [\hat{B}, \hat{H}] \neq 0 \tag{37}$$

‖ We have rewritten his formula slightly using $\langle\hat{a}\rangle_{\rm eq} = \frac{d}{dt}\langle\hat{c}(t)\rangle_{\rm eq}\big|_{t=0} = 0$.

is necessary for the applicability of the Kubo formula, because otherwise it would give an unphysical result, $\Phi_{ba}(t) = \Theta(t)\beta\langle\Delta\hat{a};\Delta\hat{b}\rangle_{\rm eq} = \Theta(t) \times$ constant, which means that $F(t)$ at a remote past would affect the present nonequilibrium state. A related necessary condition is

$$\lim_{\epsilon\searrow 0}\lim_{N\propto V\to\infty}\epsilon\int_0^\infty \langle\hat{C}/N;\hat{B}(t)/N\rangle_{\rm eq}e^{-\epsilon t}dt = \lim_{N\propto V\to\infty}\langle\hat{C}/N\rangle_{\rm eq}\langle\hat{B}/N\rangle_{\rm eq}, \quad (38)$$

where the corresponding condition in [8] has been improved using the results of Appendix A. Hence, in general, it is not justified to apply the Kubo formula to integral systems that have many additive conserved observables [39]. We henceforth *assume that the above necessary conditions are both satisfied.*

5.2. Violation in time domain

Disturbances by measurements were completely neglected when deriving (33), as discussed in section 2. On the other hand, we have shown in section 4.1 that the disturbances on additive observables are $O(\sqrt{N})$ even if measurements are quasiclassical, i.e., even if they mimic classical ideal measurements as closely as possible. Let us discuss impacts of this result on the FDT.

To measure the temporal equilibrium fluctuation, one takes $F(t) = 0$ and measures the time correlation of $\hat{a} = \hat{A}/\sqrt{N}$ and $\hat{b}(t) = \hat{B}(t)/\sqrt{N}$. Even if this measurement is quasiclassical,

$$\text{disturbances on } \Delta\hat{a} \text{ and } \Delta\hat{b} = O(\sqrt{N})/\sqrt{N} = O(1), \quad (39)$$

which does not vanish even in the thermodynamic limit. Therefore, *disturbances are significant when measuring fluctuations however large the system is.*

To measure the response function $\Phi_{ba}(t)$ in (30), one applies $F(t)$ to the system and measures the induced change of $\hat{B}/N$, i.e., $\langle\hat{B}\rangle_t/N - \langle\hat{B}\rangle_{\rm eq}/N$. We note that there is a method of measuring $\Phi_{ba}(t)$ with which disturbances are completely irrelevant, as explained, e.g., in §2 of [8], because measurement is made only once in each run of experiments. With this disturbance-irrelevant method, one can even use a detector whose measurement error $\delta B_{\rm err}$ is infinitesimal, which means that its disturbance is much larger than those of quasiclassical detectors. However, such a method is not used in ordinary experiments. Therefore, it is necessary to examine whether the same result is obtained using ordinary methods of experiments.

For example, one will perform *multi-time (or continuous) measurements* to obtain values of B/N at various times, and hence disturbances might be relevant. Furthermore, when one tries to examine the FDT, he will measure $\hat{B}/N$ (to obtain Φ_{ba}) using the *same quasiclassical detector that is used in the fluctuation measurement.* In such a typical case, assuming that the conditions (in the last paragraph of section 3.1) for the quantum central limit theorem are satisfied for sufficiently small $F(t)$, we have

$$\text{disturbance on } \hat{B}/N = O(\sqrt{N})/N = O(1/\sqrt{N}), \quad (40)$$

which is negligible for sufficiently large N. That is, *disturbances are negligible when measuring response functions quasiclassically.* Therefore, for $\Phi_{ba}(t)$ this experiment gives the same result as the experiment with the disturbance-irrelevant method.

In the derivation of the Kubo formula in [8], a response function was calculated neglecting the disturbance, while the time correlation was obtained just as a result of the calculation of the response function. Hence, according to the above result, *the formula might be correct as a recipe to calculate the response function,*¶ while measured fluctuation may possibly be described by a different expression. In fact, by fully taking account of the disturbances, we have shown that the observed fluctuation is the symmetrized time correlation, as (29), which does not agree with the canonical time correlation:+

$$\langle \tfrac{1}{2}\{\Delta\hat{a}, \Delta\hat{b}(t)\}\rangle_{\rm eq} \neq \langle \Delta\hat{a}; \Delta\hat{b}(t)\rangle_{\rm eq}. \tag{41}$$

Consequently, we arrive at figure 3. While the response function calculated from the Kubo formula might agree with the observed one, the time correlation of the Kubo formula is different from the observed one. As a result, the FDT is violated as a relation between observed quantities.

5.3. Violation in frequency domain

5.3.1. Fourier transform and causality. In experiments, it is customary to measure the linear response to an external field of a constant frequency. In such a case, one obtains the Fourier transform

$$\chi_{ba}(\omega) = \int_0^\infty \Phi_{ba}(t)\ e^{i\omega t} dt, \tag{42}$$

which is called a (generalized) *admittance*. The dynamical magnetic susceptibility and electrical conductivity are examples of the admittance. Here, the lower limit of integration is 0 because of the causality, i.e., $\Phi_{ba}(t) = 0$ for $t < 0$. This is important because, e.g., it leads to the dispersion relation [10, 38, 40], which is a universal relation between the real and imaginary parts of $\chi_{ba}(\omega)$. It plays an important role in experimental analyses because, e.g., one can estimate the real part by measuring the imaginary part, and vice versa.

When investigating the validity of the FDT, it is appropriate to compare $\chi_{ba}(\omega)$ with

$$S_{ba}(\omega) \equiv \int_0^\infty \Xi_{ba}(t)\ e^{i\omega t} dt, \tag{43}$$

where the lower limit of integration is taken 0 as in (42). By contrast, if we compared $\chi_{ba}(\omega)$ with

$$\tilde{S}_{ba}(\omega) \equiv \int_{-\infty}^\infty \tilde{\Xi}_{ba}(t)\ e^{i\omega t} dt, \tag{44}$$

¶ For other possible problems of the Kubo formula, see, e.g., [39].

+ Although they would agree with each other when $[\hat{A}, \hat{H}] = [\hat{B}, \hat{H}] = 0$, the necessary condition (37) is not satisfied in such a case.

the FDT would be partially violated even for classical systems (see Appendix C). Since such an apparent violation is not interesting to us, we will compare $\chi_{ba}(\omega)$ with $S_{ba}(\omega)$. Then, the FDT states

$$\chi_{ba}(\omega) \stackrel{?}{=} \beta S_{ba}(\omega) \quad \text{for all } \omega. \tag{45}$$

Let us investigate whether it would hold as a relation between observed quantities. In doing so, *we assume that the Kubo formula is a correct recipe to calculate the response function*, as discussed in section 5.2.

5.3.2. Symmetric and antisymmetric parts. The admittance $\chi_{ba}(\omega)$ represents the response of $\hat{B}$ to $Fe^{-i\omega t}$ that couples to $\hat{C}$ as (31), where $\hat{A} = d\hat{C}/dt$ as (35). If we interchange $\hat{A}$ and $\hat{B}$, we obtain $\chi_{ab}(\omega)$, which represents the response of $\hat{A}$ to $Fe^{-i\omega t}$ that couples to $\hat{D}$, where $\hat{B} = d\hat{D}/dt$. If the system has the time-reversal symmetry, they satisfy the reciprocal relations [41, 42, 5, 10] (for their validity, see section 6.2),

$$\chi_{ba}(\omega) = \epsilon_a \epsilon_b \chi_{ab}(\omega), \tag{46}$$

where ϵ_a and ϵ_b are the parity ($= \pm 1$) of $\hat{a}$ and $\hat{b}$ under the time reversal. [For example, $\epsilon_j = -1$ for the current density $\hat{j}$.] The time-reversal symmetry is broken when, e.g., a magnetic field $\boldsymbol{h}$ is applied to the system. In such a case, (46) is generalized as

$$\chi_{ba}(\omega; \boldsymbol{h}) = \epsilon_a \epsilon_b \chi_{ab}(\omega; -\boldsymbol{h}). \tag{47}$$

Hence, it is convenient to introduce

$$\chi^{\pm}_{ba}(\omega; \boldsymbol{h}) \equiv [\chi_{ba}(\omega; \boldsymbol{h}) \pm \chi_{ab}(\omega; \boldsymbol{h})]/2 \tag{48}$$

which is called the symmetric (+) and antisymmetric (−) parts of the admittance [10]. Henceforth, we denote $\chi^{\pm}_{ba}(\omega; \boldsymbol{h})$ simply by $\chi^{\pm}_{ba}(\omega)$. According to (46), depending on the sign of $\epsilon_a \epsilon_b$, *either one of* $\chi^{\pm}_{ba}(\omega)$ *vanishes for all* ω *if the system has the time-reversal symmetry* (i.e., if $\boldsymbol{h} = \boldsymbol{0}$). In the case of the electrical conductivity tensor $\sigma_{\mu\nu}(\omega)$, for example, the antisymmetric part vanishes when $\boldsymbol{h} = \boldsymbol{0}$.

To investigate (45), we also introduce

$$S^{\pm}_{ba}(\omega; \boldsymbol{h}) \equiv [S_{ba}(\omega; \boldsymbol{h}) \pm S_{ab}(\omega; \boldsymbol{h})]/2, \tag{49}$$

which is henceforth denoted simply by $S^{\pm}_{ba}(\omega)$. Then, (45) is equivalent to

$$\chi^{\pm}_{ba}(\omega) \stackrel{?}{=} \beta S^{\pm}_{ba}(\omega) \quad \text{for all } \omega. \tag{50}$$

We furthermore introduce

$$\tilde{S}^{\pm}_{ba}(\omega; \boldsymbol{h}) \equiv [\tilde{S}_{ba}(\omega; \boldsymbol{h}) \pm \tilde{S}_{ab}(\omega; \boldsymbol{h})]/2, \tag{51}$$

henceforth denoted by $\tilde{S}^{\pm}_{ba}(\omega)$. It is easily shown that $\tilde{S}^{+}_{ba}$ is real and $\tilde{S}^{-}_{ba}$ is pure imaginary, i.e.,

$$\mathrm{Im}\tilde{S}^{+}_{ba}(\omega) = \mathrm{Re}\tilde{S}^{-}_{ba}(\omega) = 0. \tag{52}$$

Relations between $S^{\pm}_{ba}(\omega)$ and $\tilde{S}^{\pm}_{ba}(\omega)$ are described in Appendix B.

5.3.3. inspection of FDT. Since we assume, as discussed above, that the Kubo formula is a correct recipe to calculate the response function, $\chi^{\pm}_{ba}(\omega)$ is obtained from (33), (42) and (48) (see Appendix A for details). To compare it with $S^{\pm}_{ba}(\omega)$, we note the well-known relation

$$I_\beta(\omega)\int_{-\infty}^{\infty}\langle\Delta\hat{a};\Delta\hat{b}(t)\rangle_{\rm eq}\,e^{i\omega t}dt=\beta\int_{-\infty}^{\infty}\langle\tfrac{1}{2}\{\Delta\hat{a},\Delta\hat{b}(t)\}\rangle_{\rm eq}\,e^{i\omega t}dt, \tag{53}$$

where

$$I_\beta(\omega)\equiv\frac{\beta\hbar\omega}{2}\coth\left(\frac{\beta\hbar\omega}{2}\right)\sim\begin{cases}1 & (\hbar\omega\ll k_{\rm B}T)\\ \beta\hbar\omega/2 & (\hbar\omega\gg k_{\rm B}T)\end{cases} \tag{54}$$

is the factor often encountered in quantum statistical mechanics. Since $I_\beta(\omega)\to 1$ as $\hbar\omega/k_{\rm B}T\to 0$, the frequency region $\hbar\omega\ll k_{\rm B}T$ is sometimes called the *classical regime*. Note, however, that it is completely different from the *classical limit*, $\hbar\to 0$, as shown below.

Using the above equations and those in Appendix B, we find

$$\mathrm{Re}\chi^{+}_{ba}(\omega)=\beta\mathrm{Re}S^{+}_{ba}(\omega)/I_\beta(\omega), \tag{55}$$

$$\mathrm{Im}\chi^{+}_{ba}(\omega)=\beta\mathrm{Im}S^{+}_{ba}(\omega)+\beta\int_{-\infty}^{\infty}\frac{\mathcal{P}}{\omega'-\omega}\Big[1-\frac{1}{I_\beta(\omega')}\Big]\mathrm{Re}\tilde{S}^{+}_{ba}(\omega')\,\frac{d\omega'}{2\pi}, \tag{56}$$

$$\mathrm{Re}\chi^{-}_{ba}(\omega)=\beta\mathrm{Re}S^{-}_{ba}(\omega)-\beta\int_{-\infty}^{\infty}\frac{\mathcal{P}}{\omega'-\omega}\Big[1-\frac{1}{I_\beta(\omega')}\Big]\mathrm{Im}\tilde{S}^{-}_{ba}(\omega')\,\frac{d\omega'}{2\pi}, \tag{57}$$

$$\mathrm{Im}\chi^{-}_{ba}(\omega)=\beta\mathrm{Im}S^{-}_{ba}(\omega)/I_\beta(\omega), \tag{58}$$

where $\mathcal{P}$ denotes the principal value. We can inspect the validity of the FDT (50) using these formulas.

First of all, as $\hbar\to 0$ the above relations yield (50). Therefore, *in the classical limit the FDT holds completely for both symmetric and antisymmetric parts.* (As discussed in Appendix C, this simple property would be lost if we employed $\tilde{S}^{\pm}$ instead of $S^{\pm}$ as fluctuation.) Actually, however, $\hbar$ is finite in quantum systems, for which the FDT is partially violated as follows.

For the real symmetric part $\mathrm{Re}\chi^{+}_{ba}(\omega)$, (54) and (55) show that the FDT holds in the classical regime $\hbar\omega\ll k_{\rm B}T$, but it is violated for $\hbar\omega\gtrsim k_{\rm B}T$. [The same can be said for the imaginary antisymmetric part $\mathrm{Im}\chi^{-}_{ba}(\omega)$.] For the real antisymmetric part $\mathrm{Re}\chi^{-}_{ba}(\omega)$, (57) shows that *the FDT is violated at all* ω, even in the classical regime. [The same can be said for the imaginary symmetric part $\mathrm{Im}\chi^{+}_{ba}(\omega)$.]

The last point can be seen clearly by taking $\omega=0$, which is completely in the classical regime. Then (57) gives

$$\mathrm{Re}\chi^{-}_{ba}(0)=\beta\mathrm{Re}S^{-}_{ba}(0)-\beta\int_{-\infty}^{\infty}\frac{\mathcal{P}}{\omega'}\Big[1-\frac{1}{I_\beta(\omega')}\Big]\mathrm{Im}\tilde{S}^{-}_{ba}(\omega')\,\frac{d\omega'}{2\pi}. \tag{59}$$

Since the last integral does not vanish in general for the systems for which $\chi^{-}_{ba}(\omega)\neq 0$, the FDT is violated even at $\omega=0$. To understand this result, note that there are two ways to reach the classical regime, $\hbar\omega\ll k_BT$. One is to take $\hbar\to 0$, where the system becomes classical and the violation disappears. The other is to take $\omega\to 0$ while

keeping $\hbar$ constant, where the violation occurs. Therefore, *the violation of the FDT is a genuine quantum effect, which appears in macroscopic scales* (see also section 6.1).

5.4. Example – electrical conductivity tensor

As an example, we consider the electrical conductivity tensor $\sigma_{\mu\nu}(\omega)$ in a magnetic field $\boldsymbol{h} = (0, 0, h)$, for $\mu, \nu = x, y$.* Since we assume that the Kubo formula is a correct recipe, the observed conductivity (admittance) is given by

$$\sigma_{\mu\nu}(\omega) = \int_0^\infty \langle \hat{j}_\nu; \hat{j}_\mu(t) \rangle_{\rm eq} \, e^{i\omega t} dt. \tag{60}$$

We compare it with the observed spectrum intensity of the fluctuation,

$$S_{\mu\nu}(\omega) = \int_0^\infty \langle \tfrac{1}{2}\{\hat{j}_\nu, \hat{j}_\mu(t)\} \rangle_{\rm eq} \, e^{i\omega t} dt, \tag{61}$$

where we have taken the lower limit of integration 0, as discussed in section 5.3.1.

We consider a system that is invariant under rotation by $\pi/2$ about the z axis. Then the obvious symmetries $\sigma_{xy} = -\sigma_{yx}$ and so on yield

$$\text{symmetric parts: } \sigma^+_{xx} = \sigma^+_{yy} = \sigma_{xx} = \sigma_{yy}, \ \sigma^+_{xy} = \sigma^+_{yx} = 0, \tag{62}$$

$$\text{antisymmetric parts: } \sigma^-_{xx} = \sigma^-_{yy} = 0, \ \sigma^-_{xy} = -\sigma^-_{yx} = \sigma_{xy} = -\sigma_{yx}, \tag{63}$$

and similarly for $S^\pm_{\mu\nu}$ and $\tilde{S}^\pm_{\mu\nu}$. Hence, the symmetric and antisymmetric parts of $\sigma_{\mu\nu}$ are the diagonal and off-diagonal (Hall) conductivity, σ_{xx} and σ_{xy}, respectively.

At $\omega = 0$, (42) and (43) show that $\sigma_{\mu\nu}(0)$ and $S_{\mu\nu}(0)$ are real because $\Phi_{ba}(t)$ and $\Xi_{ba}(t)$ are real. Hence, one is usually more interested in the real part, Reσ_{xx} and Reσ_{xy}, although Imσ_{xx} and Imσ_{xy} are finite for $\omega \neq 0$. Let us therefore study Reσ_{xx} and Reσ_{xy}.

For the real symmetric part, Reσ^+_{xx} = Reσ_{xx}, (55) gives

$$\mathrm{Re}\sigma_{xx}(\omega) = \beta \mathrm{Re} S_{xx}(\omega)/I_\beta(\omega) \tag{64}$$

$$= \begin{cases} \beta \mathrm{Re} S_{xx}(\omega) & (\hbar\omega \ll k_{\rm B}T), \\ (2/\hbar\omega)\mathrm{Re} S_{xx}(\omega) & (\hbar\omega \gg k_{\rm B}T). \end{cases} \tag{65}$$

Therefore, the FDT holds in the classical regime $\hbar\omega \ll k_{\rm B}T$, whereas it is violated for $\hbar\omega \gtrsim k_{\rm B}T$. Interestingly, (64) gives $I_\beta(\omega)\mathrm{Re}\sigma_{xx}(\omega) = \beta \mathrm{Re} S_{xx}(\omega)$, the integral of which over ω (i.e., the relation for the $t = 0$ components) coincides with Eq. (4.8) of Callen and Welton [6] (who did not take account of disturbances by measurements), but not with the results of Nakano [7], Kubo [8], or Nyquist [3]. This is because, as discussed in section 4.2, one can forget about disturbances if the symmetrized time correlation is employed upon quantizing a classical model.

Regarding the real antisymmetric part, Reσ^-_{xy} = Reσ_{xy}, we compare it with the real part of $S^-_{xy}(\omega) = S_{xy}(\omega) = \int_0^\infty \langle \frac{1}{2}\{\hat{j}_x, \hat{j}_y(t)\} \rangle_{\rm eq} \, e^{i\omega t} dt$. They become finite only when

* Although μ, ν correspond to j_μ, j_ν, respectively, according to our notation of $\chi_{ba}(\omega)$, we write $\sigma_{j_\mu j_\nu}$ as $\sigma_{\mu\nu}$ to indicate that it is a tensor.

$\boldsymbol{h}$ is applied (for systems invariant under rotation by $\pi/2$ about the z axis). According to (57), they are related by

$$\mathrm{Re}\sigma_{xy}(\omega) = \beta \mathrm{Re} S_{xy}(\omega) - \beta \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{\mathcal{P}}{\omega - \omega'} \Big[1 - \frac{1}{I_\beta(\omega')} \Big] \mathrm{Im} \tilde{S}_{xy}(\omega') \, \frac{d\omega'}{2\pi}. \quad (66)$$

Therefore, when $\boldsymbol{h} \neq 0$, the FDT is *violated at all* ω, including the classical regime. Even at $\omega = 0$, for which $\sigma_{xy}(0)$ and $S_{xy}(0)$ are real, it is violated because

$$\sigma_{xy}(0) = \beta S_{xy}(0) - \beta \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{\mathcal{P}}{\omega'} \Big[1 - \frac{1}{I_\beta(\omega')} \Big] \mathrm{Im} \tilde{S}_{xy}(\omega') \, \frac{d\omega'}{2\pi}, \quad (67)$$

where the last integral does not vanish when $\sigma_{xy} \neq 0$ since its integrand is the product of the odd function $1/\omega'$, the even one $1 - 1/I_\beta(\omega')$, and the odd one $\tilde{S}_{xy}(\omega')$. This violation will be confirmed experimentally, by measuring $\sigma_{xy}(0)$ and $S_{xy}(0)$ independently. Note that σ_{xy} is not related to dissipation directly, because the power supplied by an electric field $\boldsymbol{E}$ is $\boldsymbol{E} \cdot \boldsymbol{j} = \sum_{\mu\mu} E_\mu \sigma_{\mu\mu} j_\mu$, However, σ_{xy} is surely a property of a nonequilibrium state because when measuring σ_{xy} one must apply $\boldsymbol{E}$, which drives the system into a nonequilibrium state and dissipation occurs, except in the extreme case where the quantum Hall effect occurs for which $\sigma_{xx} = \sigma_{yy} = 0$.

5.5. Experiments on violation

5.5.1. Notice. For $\mathrm{Re}\sigma_{xx}(\omega)$ at $\hbar\omega \ll k_\mathrm{B}T$, all the previous results for quantum systems [6, 7, 8] and the present one agree with each other and with the classical results [3, 5, 4]. This fact suggests that the FDT is relatively insensitive to the choice of measuring apparatuses for the real symmetric part in the classical regime $\hbar\omega \ll k_B T$. In fact, many experimental evidences for this case have been reported that support the FDT, in agreement with these theoretical results including ours. In these experiments, conventional measuring apparatuses were used, without considering whether they are quasiclassical.

By contrast, greater care is necessary when inspecting the FDT for other cases, e.g., for the real symmetric part at higher frequencies and for the real antisymmetric part. In these cases, our results predict the violation. To confirm this prediction experimentally, measurements should be quasiclassical because otherwise disturbances by measurements would be larger and consequently the FDT would appear to be violated *more greatly*, and one could not tell whether the FDT is really violated. To avoid such an apparent violation, quasiclassical measurements should be made, which mimic classical ideal measurements.

Note that conventional measurements are not necessarily quasiclassical. When measuring electromagnetic fields, for example, Glauber showed that conventional photodetectors, such as photodiode and photomultipliers, destroy the state by absorbing photons, and consequently they cannot measure, e.g., the zero-point fluctuation [12, 13, 14]. Such detectors are not quasiclassical, and hence are not appropriate for inspecting the validity of the FDT.

Since quasiclassical measurements are general measurements that satisfy the conditions of section 3.2, there are various ways to realize them. For example, quasiclassical measurements may be possible by using the heterodyning technique (see below) or the quantum non-demolition detectors in [43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48].

5.5.2. Violation at high frequencies. Koch *et al* [49] reported a pioneering experiment on the real symmetric parts $\mathrm{Re}\sigma_{xx}(\omega)$ and $\mathrm{Re}S_{xx}(\omega)$ (which is related to $\tilde{S}_{xx}(\omega)$ as described in Appendix B). They used the heterodyning technique, which is closer to quasiclassical than measurements with conventional detectors, because it does not destruct states by absorbing quanta. In fact, a theoretical analysis [50] of the heterodyning technique shows that the symmetric time correlation is obtained, in agreement with our result on quasiclassical measurement.

The system studied by Koch *et al* is a resistivity-shunted Josephson Junction, for which $\mathrm{Re}\sigma_{xx}(\omega)$ is nearly independent of ω for $\omega/2\pi \lesssim 2 \times 10^{12}$Hz. Hence, if the FDT held $\mathrm{Re}S_{xx}(\omega)$ would also be independent of ω. However, they found that $\mathrm{Re}S_{xx}(\omega)$ increases with increasing ω for $\omega/2\pi \gtrsim 3 \times 10^{10}$Hz. This shows that the FDT is violated at such high frequencies, whereas it holds at lower frequencies, in agreement with (64).♯

5.5.3. Violation at low frequencies. For the real symmetric part, such a high frequency is necessary to observe the violation because the FDT is not violated in the classical regime. This seems a reason why the FDT violation was not found in earlier experiments such as the pioneering experiment by Johnson [2].

For the real antisymmetric part, by contrast, we have shown that the the FDT is violated at all ω, even in the classical regime including $\omega = 0$. To the authors' knowledge, no experiments have been reported which inspected the validity of the FDT for the real antisymmetric part. This might be because, for systems with the time-reversal symmetry, the antisymmetric part vanishes if the symmetric part is finite, as discussed in section 5.3.2. In the case of the electrical conductivity tensor $\sigma_{\mu\nu}(\omega)$, for example, the antisymmetric part vanishes when a magnetic field $\boldsymbol{h} = \boldsymbol{0}$ (for systems invariant under rotation by $\pi/2$ about the z axis), as discussed in section 5.4. It is therefore expected that the violation at low frequencies will be observed if one measure $\sigma^{-}_{xy} = \sigma_{xy}$ and $S^{-}_{xy} = S_{xy}$ independently in the presence of $\boldsymbol{h}$.

6. Discussions

6.1. Why quantum effects survive on the macroscopic scale?

We have shown that the violation of the FDT is a genuine quantum effect. On the other hand, the FDT relates the response and fluctuation of macrovariables. One might question why a quantum effect survives on the macroscopic scale.

♯ When a conventional detector was used, they observed that $S_{xx}(\omega)$ *decreases* with increasing ω. This agrees *not* with Callen and Welton [6], Nakano [7], or Kubo [8], but with Nyquist [3], who introduced a quantum effect intuitively into his classical theory.

This question might be based on the following argument. Consider two additive operators,

$$\hat{A} = \sum_{\boldsymbol{r}} \hat{\xi}(\boldsymbol{r}),\ \hat{B} = \sum_{\boldsymbol{r}} \hat{\zeta}(\boldsymbol{r}). \tag{68}$$

Their *densities* tend to commute as $N \to \infty$:

$$[\hat{A}/N, \hat{B}/N] = \frac{1}{N^2} \sum_{\boldsymbol{r}} [\hat{\xi}(\boldsymbol{r}), \hat{\zeta}(\boldsymbol{r})] = \frac{1}{N^2}\ O(N) \to 0. \tag{69}$$

This equation looks as if it showed that the system would behave like a classical system for sufficiently large N when one looks at densities of additive observables.

Such a naive argument is false. For example, by applying a magnetic field to a magnetic material one can induce magnetization $\boldsymbol{M}/N$, which is the density of magnetic moments. However, according to the Bohr-van Leeuwen theorem, $\boldsymbol{M}/N = 0$ in any equilibrium states of classical systems. Therefore, magnetism is a quantum effect that survives on the macroscopic scale. Although $\hbar$ is small, its effect on each particle is significant, and a collection of Avogadro's number of particles yields a quantum effect on the macroscopic scale, because a small number ($\propto \hbar$) times a large number ($\propto$ Avogadro's number) is an ordinary number.

Furthermore, (69) is not appropriate for fluctuations, because fluctuations are $O(\sqrt{N})$. If we scale $\Delta\hat{A}, \Delta\hat{B}$ correctly, we find

$$[\Delta\hat{A}/\sqrt{N}, \Delta\hat{B}/\sqrt{N}] = [\Delta\hat{a}, \Delta\hat{b}] = O(1), \tag{70}$$

which does not vanish even in the thermodynamic limit. This clearly shows that *disturbances are significant when measuring fluctuations however large the system is.*

6.2. Quantum violation of Onsager's regression hypothesis

In his famous papers [41, 42], Onsager assumed "the average regression of equilibrium fluctuations will obey the same laws as the corresponding macroscopic irreversible processes." Under this hypothesis, called the 'regression hypothesis,' he derived the reciprocal relations for classical systems. For classical systems, this hypothesis and the FDT were proved by Takahashi microscopically from Newtonian mechanics [5].

For quantum systems, contradictory opinions have been claimed. Assuming that the symmetrized time correlation is the equilibrium fluctuation in the hypothesis, Kubo and Yokota [51], Talkner [52], and Ford and O'Connel [53] pointed out that the hypothesis is inconsistent with the Kubo formula. On the other hand, Nakajima showed that the inconsistency can be removed if a local equilibrium state is assumed for the state during fluctuation [54]. His idea was incorporated in [55], where a quantum-mechanical formula for responses to 'non-mechanical forces' (such as the temperature difference) was derived.

These contradicting opinions originated from different assumptions. Unfortunately, as in the case of the FDT, it was hard to examine the assumptions at the time of the above pioneering works because neither quantum measurement theory [12, 13, 14, 15] nor

theory of macroscopic quantum systems [16, 17, 18, 19, 20] was developed enough. With the help of development of these theories in last few decades, we have *proved* that the symmetrized time correlation is *always* obtained by quasiclassical measurements. That is, the observed regression of equilibrium fluctuations are given by the symmetrized time correlations, which do not agree with the canonical time correlations. Therefore, if the Kubo formula is a correct recipe to calculate the response functions, the regression hypothesis cannot be valid in quantum systems as relations between observed quantities.

Then, one might wonder if the reciprocal relations hold in quantum systems because Onsager derived them from the regression hypothesis [41, 42]. Fortunately, however, the reciprocal relations hold if the Kubo formula is a correct recipe because they can be derived from the Kubo formula without the regression hypothesis [8].

Furthermore, the quantum-mechanical formula for responses to non-mechanical forces in [55] may also be justified by regarding the local equilibrium state in the theory not as the state that is observed during fluctuation (which is analyzed in section 4.1 and section 6.3) but as the local equilibrium state that is realized with appropriate constraints.

6.3. Relaxation of squeezed equilibrium state

It is seen in section 4.1 that the post-measurement state $|\beta; a_\bullet\rangle$ of the first measurement is a squeezed equilibrium state, which is macroscopically identical to $|\beta\rangle$ but is squeezed along $\hat{a}$, as shown in Figure 5. During the interval between the first and the second measurements, the system evolves freely. In this interval, the expectation value and the variance of an additive operator $\hat{B} = \hat{b}\sqrt{N}$ is calculated, for the Gaussian f, as

$$\langle \hat{b}(t)\rangle_{a_\bullet} = \langle \hat{b}\rangle_{\rm eq} + \frac{\langle \frac{1}{2}\{\Delta\hat{a}, \Delta\hat{b}(t)\}\rangle_{\rm eq}}{\delta a^2_{\rm eq} + \delta a^2_{\rm err}} \Delta a_\bullet. \tag{71}$$

$$\langle (\hat{b}(t) - \langle \hat{b}(t)\rangle_{a_\bullet})^2\rangle_{a_\bullet} = \delta b^2_{\rm eq} - \frac{\langle \frac{1}{2}\{\Delta\hat{a}, \Delta\hat{b}(t)\}\rangle^2_{\rm eq}}{\delta a^2_{\rm eq} + \delta a^2_{\rm err}} + \frac{\langle \frac{1}{2i}[\hat{a}, \hat{b}(t)]\rangle^2_{\rm eq}}{\delta a^2_{\rm err}}. \tag{72}$$

Hence, as shown in Figure 6, they evolve with increasing t, and relax to the original values, $\langle \hat{b}\rangle_{\rm eq}$ and $\delta b^2_{\rm eq}$, if the system has the 'mixing property' in the sense that††

$$\lim_{t\to\infty} \lim_{N\propto V\to\infty} \langle \tfrac{1}{2}\{\Delta\hat{a}, \Delta\hat{b}(t)\}\rangle_{\rm eq} = 0 \ \text{ and } \ \lim_{t\to\infty} \lim_{N\propto V\to\infty} \langle \tfrac{1}{2i}[\hat{a}, \hat{b}(t)]\rangle_{\rm eq} \to 0. \tag{73}$$

After the relaxation, one cannot distinguish $|\beta; a_\bullet\rangle$ from $|\beta\rangle$ by macroscopic observations, i.e., the system 'thermalizes.'

In short, the squeezed equilibrium state $|\beta; a_\bullet\rangle$ is a time-evolving state, in which macrovariables fluctuate and relax, unlike the thermal pure quantum state $|\beta\rangle$ or the Gibbs state $e^{-\beta\hat{H}}/Z$. Such a state should be realized during quasiclassical measurements of temporal equilibrium fluctuations.

†† The order of the two limits, $\lim_{t\to\infty}$ and $\lim_{N\propto V\to\infty}$, cannot be inverted because of the quantum recurrence. See Appendix A for a related discussion.



Figure 6. Schematic plots of the distribution of an additive observable A during the interval between the first and the second measurements.

6.4. Measurement with lower time resolution

In real experiments, the time resolution of a detector is finite. Let us consider how (55) and (57) are modified when $\chi^{\pm}_{ba}(\omega)$ and $S^{\pm}_{ba}(\omega)$ are measured with such a detector.

For simplicity, we model a detector of finite time resolution as a combination of a low-pass filter and a (quasiclassical) detector of infinitesimal time resolution. For the band-pass filter, we assume an ideal one, whose frequency response $w(\omega)$ is a smooth real function that satisfies

$$w(0) = 1,\ w(-\omega) = w(\omega),\ |w(\omega)| \ll 1 \text{ for } \omega \gg \Omega. \tag{74}$$

Here, $\Omega > 0$ is the cutoff frequency of the filter.

When $\hat{B}$ is measured with such a detector of finite time resolution, what are obtained as $\chi^{\pm}(\omega)$ and $S^{\pm}(\omega)$ (the subscript ba is omitted here) are respectively

$$\chi^{\pm}_w(\omega) \equiv w(\omega)\chi^{\pm}(\omega), \tag{75}$$

$$S^{\pm}_w(\omega) \equiv [w(\omega)]^2 S^{\pm}(\omega). \tag{76}$$

From (55) and (57), they are related by

$$\mathrm{Re}\chi^{+}_w(\omega) = \beta \mathrm{Re}S^{+}_w(\omega)/w(\omega) I_\beta(\omega), \tag{77}$$

$$\mathrm{Re}\chi^{-}_w(\omega) = \beta \mathrm{Re}S^{-}_w(\omega)/w(\omega) - \beta w(\omega) \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{\mathcal{P}}{\omega' - \omega} \left[1 - \frac{1}{I_\beta(\omega')}\right] \mathrm{Im}\tilde{S}^{-}(\omega') \frac{d\omega'}{2\pi}. \tag{78}$$

Note here that we consider the case where $\tilde{S}^{-}(\omega)$ in the last term is not measured because it is sufficient for confirming the FDT violation to measure $\chi^{\pm}(\omega)$ and $S^{\pm}(\omega)$. The value of the last term is determined by the physical properties of the system.

Therefore, for the symmetric part the FDT violation is detectable only when $\hbar\Omega \gtrsim k_{\rm B}T$ and $\hbar\omega \gtrsim k_{\rm B}T$. By contrast, for the antisymmetric part the FDT violation is detectable for all ω such that $\omega \lesssim \Omega$ even if $\hbar\Omega \ll k_{\rm B}T$. In particular, for $\omega = 0$ the same result as (59) is obtained. Therefore, *the FDT violation for the antisymmetric part is fully detectable by a quasiclassical detector even if its time resolution is poor.*

7. Summary

We have studied whether the FDT holds as a relation between observed quantities in macroscopic quantum systems. To exclude unphysical and trivial violation by violent measurements, we consider the case where measurements are made in an ideal way that mimics classical ideal measurements as closely as possible. We call such measurements quasiclassical.

Assuming quasiclassical measurements, we study what is observed when the temporal equilibrium fluctuation is measured. We have found that the symmetrized time correlation is obtained quite generally. As a result, the FDT is violated as a relation between observed quantities. This is a genuine quantum effect, which survives on a macroscopic scale.

In terms of the (generalized) admittance, which is the Fourier transform of the response function, the violation is summarized as follows. For the real symmetric part and the imaginary antisymmetric part, the FDT is violated at high frequencies $\hbar\omega \gtrsim k_B T$. A previous experiment on the diagonal conductivity ${\rm Re}\sigma_{xx}(\omega)$ reported an evidence.

For the real antisymmetric part and imaginary symmetric part, the FDT is violated at all frequencies. It is violated even at $\omega = 0$ for the real antisymmetric part (while the imaginary symmetric part vanishes at $\omega = 0$). To the authors' knowledge, no experiment has been reported that examined the FDT in such a case. The violation should be confirmed experimentally by measuring independently the admittance and the time correlation for the case of, e.g., the Hall conductivity and the corresponding current-current correlation in the presence of a magnetic field.

In measurement of the temporal equilibrium fluctuation, two- or more-times measurements should be made in each run of experiment. Just after the first measurement, the post-measurement state is a squeezed equilibrium state, which is macroscopically identical to the Gibbs and thermal pure quantum state but is squeezed by the measurement. It is a time-evolving state, in which macrovariables fluctuate and relax, unlike the Gibbs or thermal pure quantum state. Such an interesting state should be realized during quasiclassical measurements of temporal equilibrium fluctuations.

Acknowledgments

We thank K. Asano, H. Tasaki and Y. Oono for discussions on the Kubo formula. This work was supported by The Japan Society for the Promotion of Science, KAKENHI

No. 26287085 and No. 15H05700.

Appendix A. Order of various limits and integral in Kubo formula

In this appendix, we note a point that is important to perform consistent calculations. Although this point is often disregarded in the literature, careless treatments lead to many unphysical results, which are often found in the literature.

Substituting (33) for $\Phi_{ba}(t)$ in (42), we have

$$\chi_{ba}(\omega) = \int_0^\infty \lim_{N\propto V\to\infty} \beta\langle\Delta\hat{a};\Delta\hat{b}(t)\rangle_{\rm eq}\, e^{i\omega t}dt. \tag{A.1}$$

Since the thermodynamic limit is taken before the time integral, this formula is not useful for studying properties of $\chi_{ba}(\omega)$. We therefore rewrite it as follows.

We assume that the system has the mixing property in the sense that

$$\lim_{t\to\infty}\lim_{N\propto V\to\infty}\langle\Delta\hat{a};\Delta\hat{b}(t)\rangle_{\rm eq} = 0, \tag{A.2}$$

which is actually a necessary condition for the validity of the Kubo formula. Then, it would be safe to rewrite (A.1) as

$$\chi_{ba}(\omega) = \lim_{\epsilon\searrow 0}\int_0^\infty \lim_{N\propto V\to\infty} \beta\langle\Delta\hat{a};\Delta\hat{b}(t)\rangle_{\rm eq}\, e^{i\omega t-\epsilon t}dt. \tag{A.3}$$

For finite V, $\langle\Delta\hat{a};\Delta\hat{b}(t)\rangle_{\rm eq}$ exhibits the quantum recurrence, and the recurrence time increases with increasing V. Hence, for given $\epsilon > 0$, it is expected that the V dependence of $\langle\Delta\hat{a};\Delta\hat{b}(t)\rangle_{\rm eq}e^{-\epsilon t}$ becomes negligible for sufficiently large V. Therefore, we may rewrite (A.3) as

$$\chi_{ba}(\omega) = \lim_{\epsilon\searrow 0}\lim_{N\propto V\to\infty}\int_0^\infty \beta\langle\Delta\hat{a};\Delta\hat{b}(t)\rangle_{\rm eq}\, e^{i\omega t-\epsilon t}dt. \tag{A.4}$$

Since V is finite in this time integral, this formula is useful for studying properties of $\chi_{ba}(\omega)$. For example, one can express the integral using the energy eigenvalues and eigenstates. [This is impossible for an infinite system because, e.g., the Hamiltonian is ill-defined (although the local Hamiltonian density is well-defined).] In such a case, however, *the limit $\epsilon \searrow 0$ should not be taken before the thermodynamic limit.* Otherwise, unphysical results would be obtained, which are, unfortunately, often found in the literature.

We have used (A.1) and (A.4) interchangeably in section 5.3, although the limit symbols and the factor $e^{-\epsilon t}$ were not written explicitly.

Appendix B. Relations between $S^{\pm}_{ba}(\omega)$ and $\tilde{S}^{\pm}_{ba}(\omega)$

Using the convolution theorem and

$$\int_{-\infty}^\infty \Theta(t)\, e^{i\omega t}dt = \pi\delta(\omega) + i\frac{\mathcal{P}}{\omega}, \tag{B.1}$$

we can easily show

$$S^{\pm}_{ba}(\omega) = \frac{1}{2}\tilde{S}^{\pm}_{ba}(\omega) - i\int_{-\infty}^{\infty}\frac{\mathcal{P}}{\omega'-\omega}\tilde{S}^{\pm}_{ba}(\omega')\,\frac{d\omega'}{2\pi}. \tag{B.2}$$

From this and (52), we have

$$\mathrm{Re}S^{+}_{ba}(\omega) = \frac{1}{2}\mathrm{Re}\tilde{S}^{+}_{ba}(\omega), \tag{B.3}$$

$$\mathrm{Im}S^{+}_{ba}(\omega) = -\int_{-\infty}^{\infty}\frac{\mathcal{P}}{\omega'-\omega}\mathrm{Re}\tilde{S}^{+}_{ba}(\omega')\,\frac{d\omega'}{2\pi}, \tag{B.4}$$

$$\mathrm{Re}S^{-}_{ba}(\omega) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty}\frac{\mathcal{P}}{\omega'-\omega}\mathrm{Im}\tilde{S}^{-}_{ba}(\omega')\,\frac{d\omega'}{2\pi}, \tag{B.5}$$

$$\mathrm{Im}S^{-}_{ba}(\omega) = \frac{1}{2}\mathrm{Im}\tilde{S}^{-}_{ba}(\omega). \tag{B.6}$$

These relations have been used when deriving the results of section 5.3.2.

Appendix C. Apparent violation of FDT in classical systems

We have compared χ_{ba} and S_{ba} as (55) and (57), because in this case the FDT holds completely in the classical limit, $\hbar \to 0$. Similar relations between χ_{ba} and $\tilde{S}_{ba}$ were known as formal relations [10],

$$\mathrm{Re}\chi^{+}_{ba}(\omega) = \beta\mathrm{Re}\tilde{S}^{+}_{ba}(\omega)/[2I_{\beta}(\omega)], \tag{C.1}$$

$$\mathrm{Re}\chi^{-}_{ba}(\omega) = \beta\int_{-\infty}^{\infty}\frac{\mathcal{P}}{\omega'-\omega}\cdot\frac{1}{I_{\beta}(\omega')}\mathrm{Im}\tilde{S}^{-}_{ba}(\omega')\,\frac{d\omega'}{2\pi}, \tag{C.2}$$

although their physical meanings were unknown because the universality of the symmetrized time correlation was not discovered. As $\hbar \to 0$, these relations reduce to

$$\mathrm{Re}\chi^{+}_{ba}(\omega) = \beta\mathrm{Re}\tilde{S}^{+}_{ba}(\omega)/2, \tag{C.3}$$

$$\mathrm{Re}\chi^{-}_{ba}(\omega) = \beta\int_{-\infty}^{\infty}\frac{\mathcal{P}}{\omega'-\omega}\mathrm{Im}\tilde{S}^{-}_{ba}(\omega')\,\frac{d\omega'}{2\pi}. \tag{C.4}$$

(C.3) shows that the FDT holds for $\mathrm{Re}\chi^{+}_{ba}(\omega)$, where the factor 1/2 can be absorbed in the definition of the spectrum intensity $\tilde{S}^{+}_{ba}(\omega)$. For $\mathrm{Re}\chi^{-}_{ba}(\omega)$, on the other hand, one would expect the corresponding FDT as $\mathrm{Re}\chi^{-}_{ba}(\omega) = \beta\mathrm{Re}\tilde{S}^{-}_{ba}(\omega)/2$. However, this does not hold even in classical systems, as see from (52) and (C.4).

By contrast, if one compares χ_{ba} and S_{ba} as we did in this paper, the FDT holds completely in classical systems, as shown in section 5.3.3. Therefore, we consider the above FDT violation (C.4) in classical systems just as apparent violation, which comes from the improper comparison.

One might suspect that a pair of $\tilde{S}_{ba}(\omega)$ and

$$\tilde{\chi}_{ba}(\omega) \equiv \int_{0}^{\infty}\lim_{N\propto V\to\infty}\beta\langle\Delta\hat{a};\Delta\hat{b}(t)\rangle_{\mathrm{eq}}\,e^{i\omega t}dt. \tag{C.5}$$

would be a better choice for the FDT. However, such $\tilde{\chi}_{ba}(\omega)$ disagrees with the observed admittance. For example, $\tilde{\sigma}_{xx}(\omega)$ thus defined has no imaginary part (which

represents the phase shift of the response), in contradiction with experiments. [See also section 5.3.1.] Therefore, the causality of the response function, which determines the lower limit of integration over t, is very important for getting the correct admittance.

References

[1] A. Einstein, Ann. Phys., **17**, 549 (1905).
[2] J. B. Johnson, Phys. Rev. **32**, 97 (1928).
[3] H. Nyquist, Phys. Rev. **32**, 110 (1928).
[4] M. S. Green, J. Chem. Phys. **20**, 1281 (1952); *ibid* **22**, 398 (1954)
[5] H. Takahashi, J. Phys. Soc. Jpn. **7**, 439 (1952).
[6] H. B. Callen and T. A. Welton, Phys. Rev. **83**, 34 (1951).
[7] F. Nakano, Busseiron Kenkyu **84**, 25 (1955).
[8] R. Kubo, J. Phys. Soc. Jpn. **12**, 570 (1957).
[9] R. Kubo, Rep. Prog. Phys. **29** 255 (1966).
[10] R. Kubo, M. Toda, and N. Hashitsume, *Statistical Physics II: Nonequilibrium Statistical Mechanics* (Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1985).
[11] K. Fujikura and A. Shimizu, Phys. Rev. Lett. **117**, 010402 (2016).
[12] R. J. Glauber, Phys. Rev. **130**, 2529 (1963).
[13] C. W. Gardiner, *Quantum Noise* (Springer, Berlin, 1991).
[14] L. Mandel and E. Wolf, *Optical coherence and quantum optics* (Cambridge University Press, 1995).
[15] K. Koshino and A. Shimizu, Physics Reports **412**, 191 (2005), section 4.
[16] D. Goderis and P. Vets, Commun. Math. Phys. **122**, 249 (1989).
[17] T. Matsui, Rev. Math. Phys. **14**, 675 (2002).
[18] E. H. Lieb and D. W. Robinson, Commun. Math. Phys. **28**, 251 (1972).
[19] B. Nachtergaele and R. Sims, Theorem. Commun. Math. Phys. **265**, 119 (2006).
[20] B. Nachtergaele, H. Raz, B. Schlein, R. Sims, Commun. Math. Phys. **286**, 1073 (2009).
[21] S. Sugiura and A. Shimizu, Phys. Rev. Lett. **111**, 010401 (2013).
[22] J. von Neumann, Z. Phys. **57**, 30 (1929).
[23] A. Sugita, RIMS Kokyuroku (Kyoto) **1507**, 147 (2006).
[24] S. Popescu, A.J. Short, and A. Winter, Nature Phys. **2**, 754 (2006).
[25] S. Goldstein, J. L. Lebowitz, R. Tumulka, and N. Zanghi, Phys. Rev. Lett. **96**, 050403 (2006).
[26] A. Sugita, Nonlinear Phenom. Complex Syst. **10**, 192 (2007).
[27] P. Reimann, Phys. Rev. Lett. **99**, 160404 (2007).
[28] S. Sugiura and A. Shimizu, Phys. Rev. Lett. **108**, 240401 (2012).
[29] S. Sugiura and A. Shimizu, Kinki University Series on Quantum Computing **9**, 245 (2014). [arXiv:1312.5145.]
[30] M. Hyuga, S. Sugiura. K. Sakai and A. Shimizu, Phys. Rev. B **90**, 121110(R) (2014).
[31] L. D. Landau and E. M. Lifshitz, *Statistical Physics*, 3rd Edition, Part 1 (Butterworth-Heinmann, Oxford, 1980)
[32] A. Shimizu and T. Miyadera, Phys. Rev. Lett. **89**, 270503 (2002).
[33] A. Shimizu and T. Morimae, Phys. Rev. Lett. **95**, 090401 (2005).
[34] K. Fujikura, Master Thesis (University of Tokyo, 2015).
[35] E. Arthurs and M. S. Goodman, Phys. Rev. Lett. **60**, 2447 (1988).
[36] M. A. Nielsen and I. L. Chuang, *Quantum Computation and Quantum Information* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2000).
[37] H. M. Wiseman and G. J. Milburn, *Quantum Measurement and Control* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2010).
[38] D. Zubarev, V. Morozov and G. Röpke, *Statistical Mechanics of Nonequilibirum Processes* Volume 1 (Akademie Verlag, Berlin, 1996).

[39] A. Shimizu and H. Kato, *Nonequilibrium Mesoscopic Conductors Driven by Reservoirs, Low-Dimensional Systems — Interactions and Transport Properties* [ed. T. Brandes], Lecture Notes in Physics 54, pp.3-22 (Springer, 2000); arXiv:cond-mat/9911333.
[40] A. Shimizu and T. Yuge, J. Phys. Soc. Jpn. **79**, 013002 (2010).
[41] L. Onsager, Phys. Rev. **37**, 405 (1931).
[42] L. Onsager, Phys. Rev. **38**, 2265 (1931).
[43] A. Shimizu, Abstracts of the Spring Meeting of the Physical Society of Japan (Physical Society of Japan, Tokyo, 1990), paper no. 2aR7, in which QND photodetectors using interferometers of massive particles were proposed for the first time.
[44] A. Shimizu, International Conference on Quantum Electronics: Technical Digest Series 1990 (Optical Society of America, Washington, D.C., 1990), Vol. 8, p. 96.
[45] A. Shimizu, Phys. Rev. A **43**, 3819 (1991).
[46] M. Brune, S. Haroche, V. Lefevre, J. M. Raimond, and N. Zagury, Phys. Rev. Lett. **65**, 976 (1990).
[47] M. D. Levenson, Phys. Rev. A **42**, 2935 (1990).
[48] A. Shimizu and K. Fujita, *Quantum Control and Measurement* [H. Ezawa and Y. Murayama, eds., North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1993] pp.191-196. quant-ph/9804026.
[49] R. H. Koch, D. J. Van Harlingen and J. Clarke, Phys. Rev. B **26**, 74 (1982).
[50] G. J. Milburn, Phys. Rev. A, **36**, 5271 (1987). In quantum optics the outgoing modes at different times commute with each other. Hence, the last term in Eq, (3.33) of this reference equals the corresponding symmetric time correlation.
[51] R. Kubo and M. Yokota, Busseiron-Kenkyu **89**, 99 (1955).
[52] P. Talkner, Ann. Phys. **167**, 390 (1986),
[53] G. W. Ford and R. F. O'Connell, Phys. Rev. Lett. **77**, 798 (1996).
[54] S. Nakajima, Busseiron-Kenkyu **102**, 24 (1956).
[55] R. Kubo, M. Yokota and S. Nakajima, J. Phys. Soc. Jpn. **12**, 1203 (1957).